

IN THE HIGH COURT OF GUJARAT AT AHMEDABAD

CRIMINAL MISC.APPLICATION No 886 of 1997

For Approval and Signature:

Hon'ble MR.JUSTICE M.S.PARIKH

=====

1. Whether Reporters of Local Papers may be allowed to see the judgements?
2. To be referred to the Reporter or not?
3. Whether Their Lordships wish to see the fair copy of the judgement?
4. Whether this case involves a substantial question of law as to the interpretation of the Constitution of India, 1950 of any Order made thereunder?
5. Whether it is to be circulated to the Civil Judge?

JALALUDDIN JUSABALI ROJANI

Versus

STATE OF GUJARAT

Appearance:

THROUGH JAIL for Petitioners (legal assistance rendered by Mr. B.C.Dave, learned Advocate)

Mr.U.R.BHATT, A.P.P. for Respondents

CORAM : MR.JUSTICE M.S.PARIKH

Date of decision: 20/03/97

ORAL JUDGEMENT

Mr.U.R.Bhatt, learned A.P.P. appeared on behalf of respondents. Mr.B.C.Dave, learned Advocate, rendered the legal assistance to the petitioners.

2. Heard. When this matter was placed for admission on 6.3.1997, following order was passed :

"Rule. Service of Rule waived by Mr. S.P.Dave,
learned A.P.P.

The grievance of the petitioner is that the COFEPOSA case No.11/96 (Criminal matter before the appropriate Court) is not proceeding for trial. The prisoner wants to know about stage of the proceedings and expeditious hearing of trial. Hence, in the first instance following direction is issued :

The Registrar of this Court will send an immediate intimation to the Chief Metropolitan Magistrate about the stage of the case mentioned in the application and call for the report about proceedings. S.O. to 20.3.1997 for that purpose."

3. The learned Addl.Chief Metropolitan Magistrate has submitted his report dated 11.3.1997 pursuant to the aforesaid direction. The report clearly indicates the progress of the matter concerning the present petitioner. It also appears from the report that there is no delay in respect of the matter proceeding in the Court. In fact some adjournments have been obtained by and on behalf of the petitioner. In that view of the matter nothing further survives in this petition.

4. In view of the fact that the matter is proceeding before the concerned Court no further order is required to be passed. Rule is accordingly discharged.

* * * * *